Hard_EnglishPassage_3014
Constitutional Jurisprudence and Landmark Judgments

Words: 400, Characters: 3654 **LEVEL: HARD**

The constitutional architecture of the world's largest, most-populous democracy is a magnificent, highly-complex amalgamation of rigid, codified legal-statutes and dynamic, ever-evolving judicial-interpretations. The Constitution of India—a voluminous, meticulously-drafted document containing an unprecedented number of articles, schedules, and administrative-directives—establishes a quasi-federal, parliamentary-democracy that carefully balances the distribution of legislative, executive, and financial-powers between the centralized Union-government and the decentralized, constituent State-governments. The fundamental, philosophical-core of this legal-masterpiece is safely enshrined in Part III (Fundamental Rights) and Part IV (Directive Principles of State Policy), which collectively mandate the state to actively pursue egalitarian, socio-economic justice while simultaneously protecting the inalienable, civil-liberties of its diverse citizens. The interpretative-authority of the Supreme Court of India was permanently, and profoundly, altered by the landmark, historic judgment delivered in the Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala case on April 24, 1973. In this highly-contentious, razor-thin (7-6) majority-verdict, the thirteen-judge constitutional-bench boldly established the revolutionary "Basic-Structure Doctrine"—a jurisprudential-innovation which unequivocally decreed that while the Parliament possesses broad, plenary-powers to amend the Constitution under Article 368, it absolutely cannot alter, destroy, or abrogate the foundational, "basic-features" of the document, such as secularism, federalism, judicial-review, and the democratic-nature of the republic. This brilliant, judicially-crafted mechanism acts as a powerful, institutional-bulwark against any potential, authoritarian-encroachment by a massive, single-party parliamentary-majority. Furthermore, the innovative, procedural-development of Public Interest Litigation (PIL)—pioneered by visionary, forward-thinking jurists like Justice P.N. Bhagwati in the late 1970s and early 1980s—fundamentally democratized access to the highest-courts. By deliberately relaxing the rigid, traditional Anglo-Saxon principle of "locus-standi" (the right or capacity to bring an action or to appear in a court), the Supreme Court allowed public-spirited citizens and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to file petitions on behalf of historically-oppressed, impoverished, and marginalized communities who lacked the financial-resources to independently navigate the labyrinthine, adversarial legal-system. Over the subsequent decades, PILs have been instrumental in enforcing strict, environmental-protection regulations, eradicating the horrific-practice of bonded-labor, and compelling the state-apparatus to provide mid-day meals in

84 163 240 320 400 481 562 647 735 824 903 993 1074 1156 1239 1312 1396 1480 1566 1653 1742 1829 1909 1992 2072 2151 2237 2317 2402 2486 2573 2657 2740 2817

© 2026 TypingGuru App
Download From Playstore

government-funded schools. However, this vast, expanded judicial-activism has also sparked intense, academic-debates regarding the delicate, constitutional-doctrine of the "separation-of-powers"; critics vehemently argue that excessive, micro-managerial judicial-interventions in purely executive or legislative-domains—often termed as "judicial-overreach"—undermine the democratic-accountability of elected-representatives. As the republic rapidly navigates the complex, twenty-first-century challenges of digital-privacy, inter-state river-water disputes, and complex, techno-legal commercial-arbitrations, the higher-judiciary must continuously, and carefully, calibrate its jurisprudential-approach to ensure rapid, equitable-justice without disrupting the harmonious, constitutional-equilibrium established by the founding-fathers.

2900
2985
3071
3153
3217
3289
3379
3452
3537
3617
3654

© 2026 TypingGuru App
Download From Playstore